

REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 1, 2000, with claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13 and 21 are the independent claims.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the phrase “the basic device.”

Claims 1-5, 7 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,580,460 (hereinafter “Takahashi”).

Claims 6 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,392,447 (hereinafter “Schlack”).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

With regard to the §112 rejection, Applicants have amended claim 20 in a manner which is believed to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to the §102(e) rejection, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Eight Edition, August 2001, §2131, specifies that a given claim is anticipated “only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference,” citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, MPEP §2131 indicates that the cited reference must show the “identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim,” citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish anticipation of claims 1-5, 7 and 21-24 by Takahashi.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an apparatus which includes a basic device having a docking interface, and an accessory device that couples to the docking interface of the basic device. The accessory device includes a control processor and a

power supply unit. The power supply unit supplies electrical energy to the control processor in response to a control signal received from the basic device and maintains the electrical energy during fluctuations of the control signal.

Thus, the invention of claim 1 is directed to an arrangement in which a power supply unit of an accessory device supplies electrical energy to a control processor of the accessory device, in response to a control signal received from the basic device.

By way of example, in an illustrative embodiment, shown in FIGS. 1 through 5 of the drawings, the basic device comprises a personal digital assistant (PDA) 10 having a docking interface 16, and the accessory device comprises a digital camera 18 that couples to the docking interface 16 of the PDA 10. The digital camera 18, as shown in FIG. 3, includes a control processor 30 and a power supply unit 34. The power supply unit 34 supplies electrical energy to the control processor 30 responsive to a CLEAR-TO-SEND (CTS) control signal received in the digital camera 18 from the PDA 10 via the docking interface 16. More particularly, if an imaging application is running on the PDA 10, the CTS control signal is set to a logic high level, which in turn causes the power supply unit 34 to supply power to the digital camera 18. See the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 1-30.

The Examiner in formulating the §102(e) rejection argues that the claimed arrangement is anticipated by the arrangement shown in FIG. 1 of Takahashi. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner asserts that the claimed basic and accessory devices correspond to printer 118 and image sensing device 117, respectively, of Takahashi. The Examiner further asserts that the power management unit 108 of the image sensing device 117 of Takahashi meets the claimed power supply unit that supplies electrical energy to a control processor in response to a control signal received from the basic device and maintains the electrical energy during fluctuations of the control signal.

However, Takahashi in column 13, lines 1-20, indicates that the image sensing device 117 upon connection to the printer 118 determines if the printer 118 can supply power to the image sensing device 117. If it is determined that the printer 118 can supply power to device 117, "the power supply source for operating the digital

image sensing device 117 is switched from the internal battery 109 of the image sensing device to electric power supplied via the cable from the power management unit 119 in the printer 118.” Otherwise, power for the digital image sensing device 117 is supplied from the battery 109. See Takahashi at column 13, lines 50-54.

Thus, Takahashi discloses an arrangement in which an accessory device receives power from a basic device based on a determination by the accessory device as to whether the basic device is capable of supplying power. In the invention of claim 1, by way of contrast, a power supply unit of the accessory device supplies electrical energy to a control processor of the accessory device in response to a control signal received from the basic device and maintains the electrical energy during fluctuations of the control signal. The claim does not call for the accessory device to receive power from the basic device, as in the Takahashi arrangement. Instead, the claim is directed to an arrangement in which the accessory device generates its own power, but under control of the basic device. This provides an advantageous power conserving feature in that the power supply unit of the accessory device need only be powered up if, for example, there is an application running on the basic device that requires use of the accessory device. See the specification at page 5, lines 26-28.

The Examiner argues that the power supplied by the printer 118 to the image sensing device 117 in Takahashi constitutes the claimed “control signal received from the basic device.” However, claim 1, as noted above, requires that the power supply unit of the accessory device supplies electrical energy in response to the control signal and maintains the electrical energy during fluctuations in the control signal. If the supplied power from the printer 118 in Takahashi is itself the claimed control signal, as alleged by the Examiner, then there is no power supply unit in image sensing device 117 that supplies electrical energy responsive to the supplied power and maintains the electrical energy during fluctuations in the supplied power. Instead, if image sensing device 117 determines that printer 118 can no longer supply power at a sufficient level, the image sensing device 117 will switch from external power to internal battery power, which is contrary to the claim limitation relating to the power supply unit maintaining electrical energy during fluctuations of the control signal.

Accordingly, it is believed that claim 1 is not anticipated by Takahashi. For similar reasons, it is believed that independent claim 21 is not anticipated by Takahashi, and that independent claim 13 is not obvious in view of Takahashi. Takahashi, by disclosing an arrangement in which power is supplied when possible from a basic device to an accessory device but the accessory device otherwise automatically operates under its own power, actually teaches away from the invention as set forth in these claims and fails to provide its associated advantages.

The Schlack reference fails to supplement the fundamental deficiencies of Takahashi as applied to the independent claims.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with regard to their respective independent claims, and are also believed to define separately-patentable subject matter over Takahashi and Schlack.

For the reasons set forth above, the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections are believed to be improper, and should be withdrawn.

Notwithstanding the traversal, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13 and 21 to clarify the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the traversal, the amendments are made not for reasons relating to patentability over the cited art, but instead simply to expedite prosecution of the application.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to specify that the control signal comprises a signal providing information indicative of whether or not an application involving use of the accessory device is currently running on the basic device.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to specify that the control signal must have one or more predetermined signal characteristics in order for the digital camera accessory device to transition from a powered-off state to a powered-on state when coupled via the docking interface to a basic device.

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 13 can be found, for example, in FIG. 5 of the drawings and in the specification at page 5, lines 2-9.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to clarify the operation of the accessory device power supply unit relative to the first and second control signals.

Support for the amendment to claim 21 can be found, for example, in FIG. 5 of the drawings and in the specification at page 5, lines 26-30.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call to attend to these matters.

In view of the foregoing, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela R. Crocker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 42,447

PRC:cjm
Telephone: (585) 477-0553
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646